are under debate has been coming up almost every year. I find that a comprehensive and detailed ruling on this subject has been given by my predecessor on the 19th of March last year.

As stated therein, and as I observed on Saturday last, so far as the Chair is concerned, it is guided by the Rules. The Rules give the right to every member, irrespective of the party to which he belongs, to give notice of cut motions and so long as a cut motion is admissible under the Rules, it has to be taken up irrespective of to which party the member belongs. Further these cut motions are printed in order of receipt and the Chair has no option but to take up the cut motions in the order in which they appear on the notice paper.

It has been suggested that cut motions should be tabled only by members of the Opposition. The other suggestions are that cut motions need not be taken up at all but the Opposition may be permitted to select subjects for debate for each day, and in the alternative, that only selected cut motions should be taken up for debate, I may state that these are all matters which are guided by understanding and agreement between the parties or members and the Chair has no voice in the procedure selected. But if any such understanding is reached among the members and is brought to the notice of the Chair, the Chair will always take note of such agreement and will implement it.

The question was raised about unattached members. I can only say, once again, that the Rules make no distinction between member and member. Even in England where the party system works so well, while the right to select the subject is left to the Opposition and independent members have no voice in the selection, the independent members do participate in the resulting debate.

There is no doubt, as observed by my predecessor, that, in order that the few days allotted for voting may serve a useful purpose, and in order that Government may be informed of the views of the House or the policies pursued by them, it is better that the members try to focus attention on the larger issues as far as possible.

I would, therefore, appeal to the Hon'ble Members, to whichever party they may belong, to try to evolve a satisfactory procedure by which the time spent on voting will prove useful and serve a purpose. But in the absence of such agreement the Chair can only follow the Rules.

Sri A. Bheemappa Naik wanted me to give a ruling on whether a statement made by the Leader of the House could not be questioned by a member of that party. This again is a matter on which the Speaker cannot and need not give a ruling. The organisation of parties and the working of the party machinery are beyond the purview of the Speaker. I may, however, say that unless the Leader of the House and the Leader of the Opposition can claim, and can be deemed, to speak for their parties, the work of the House is likely to be hampered, and it will not help in the smooth working of the Assembly.

Member's right to withdraw Notice of Motion.

MR. SPEAKER.—On Saturday last Sri V. Venkatappa and Sri A. Bheemappa Naik questioned the right of Sri K. Puttaswamy to withdraw his notice of a matter which he stated affected his privilege. This related to an incorrect and misleading report of the Proceedings in the 'Janavani' of the 16th. When Sri Puttaswamy raised it in the House on the 17th, I requested the Hon'ble Member to give a written notice which he did the same day. But before the Chair took a decision on the question of whether a *prima facie* case of privilege had been made out, the Hon'ble Member withdrew his notice. There was thus nothing for the Chair to decide and the matter therefore dropped. However, as the Hon'ble Member had also orally raised the matter in the House itself, I thought it desirable to state the fact of withdrawal to the House.

It is only when a matter is formally before the House and the House is seized of it, as after a motion has been moved, that the member who has made

(MR. SPEAKER.)

the motion can withdraw it only by the leave of the House. Till that stage is reached, a member who has given notice is entitled to withdraw and no permission is necessary for him to withdraw.

In the present case, Sri Puttaswamy was exercising his undoubted right in withdrawing. He has also explained that the newspaper has published a correction. I need not have brought it to the notice of the House but I did so because the matter had been originally raised in the House.

BUDGET FOR 1955-56—DEMANDS FOR GRANTS.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM (Jagalur).—I quite agree that it is a matter of understanding among the members as to the procedure to be adopted and we have adopted the procedure. Sir, today, subject to the approval of the Leader of the House, I take up the 'Forest' and 'Printing and Stationery.' The other Demands may be deleted, if it is acceptable to the Leader of the House and the other Members.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA (Leader of the House).—That can be done Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Does the House agree to this procedure?

MEMBERS.—Yes.

DEMAND NO. 4—FOREST.
10. FOREST.

Sri B. HUTCHE GOWDA (Turuvekere).—I oppose the demand.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will move the Demand first and then you can speak.

Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 44,30,000 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st Day of March 1956, in respect of 'Forest'."

*ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ಇಲಾಖೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ವರ್ಷದ್ ವರ್ಷ ಉತ್ಪತ್ತಿ ಕಡಮೆಯಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ; ಖರ್ಚು ಜಾಸ್ತಿಯಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಇದರ ಅಡಳಿತ ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಈಚೀಚೆಗೆ ರಾಜ ಮಹಾರಾಜರುಗಳಿಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ಚಕ್ರವರ್ತಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಪಿಕಾರಿ ನಡೆಸತಕ್ಕ ಇಲಾಖೆಯಾಗಿ ಪರಿಣಮಿಸುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಈ ಇಲಾಖೆಯವರು 30 ಲಕ್ಷ ಎಕರೆಗಳ ಕಾಡು ಪ್ರದೇಶವನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ವರ್ಷದ ಉತ್ಪತ್ತಿ 86 ಲಕ್ಷರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ, ಮುಂದಿನ ವರ್ಷ 44 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಅಂದಾಜಾಗಿದೆ. ಅದೇ ನಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಕದ ಪ್ರಾಂತ್ಯವಾದ ಕೊಡಗು ದೇಶವನ್ನು ನೋಡುವುದಾದರೆ, ಅದು ನಮ್ಮ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ 40ನೇ ಒಂದು ಭಾಗದಷ್ಟಿದ್ದರೂ, ನಮ್ಮ ಉತ್ಪತ್ತಿ ಅದರ ಉತ್ಪತ್ತಿಯ ಅರ್ಧಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಕಡಮೆಯಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ನಮಗೆ ಬರುವ 41 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ 35 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳು ಕೇವಲ ಗಂಧದ ಮರಗಳಿಂದಲೇ. ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ನಿವ್ವಳ ನಮ್ಮ ಉತ್ಪತ್ತಿ 6,20,000 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳು ಮಾತ್ರ.

ಅಲ್ಲದೆ, ಇತರ ಉತ್ಪತ್ತಿ—ಖರ್ಚು ಯಾವರೀತಿ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದೆಯೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಕಾಗದದ ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆಗೆ 1952-53 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಸರಬರಾಜುಮಾಡಿದ ಬಿದಿರು 1,72,410 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳದು. ಇದನ್ನು ಸಪ್ಲೈಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಖರ್ಚೇ 76,000 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳು. 1953-54 ರಲ್ಲಾದರೋ ಎರಡು ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಖರ್ಚಾಗಿ ಕೇವಲ 45,000 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಉಳಿತಾಯವಾಗಿದೆ. 1954-55ರಲ್ಲಿ ಇನ್ನೂ ಕಡಮೆ. 1,55,000 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಬಿದಿರು ಸರಬರಾಯಿ ಮಾಡಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಅಷ್ಟನ್ನು ಸಪ್ಲೈ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ 1,20,000 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳು ಖರ್ಚಾಗಿವೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೆ 35,000 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಉತ್ಪತ್ತಿ ಈ ವರ್ಷ. 1955-56ರ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯೂ ಆಶಾದಾಯಕವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. 2,55,000 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಬಿದಿರನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ 2,10,000 ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಖರ್ಚಾಗಿ, 45,000 ರೂಪಾಯಿ ನಿವ್ವಳ ಉತ್ಪತ್ತಿ.

ಹೀಗೆಯೇ, ಭದ್ರಾವತಿ ಕಬ್ಬಿಣದ ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆಯ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರೆ, 1955-56, 8,50,000 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಸೌದೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ 8 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಖರ್ಚಾಗಿದೆ. 1954-55ರಲ್ಲೂ ಯಥಾಪ್ರಕಾರ 8½ ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಮರ ಸಪ್ಲೈಮಾಡಿ ಕೇವಲ 50,000 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಆದಾಯ ಪಡೆದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. 1953-54ರಲ್ಲಾದರೂ 7,64,000 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಮರ ಒದಗಿಸಿದೆ, 41,000 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಆದಾಯ ಹೊಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. 1952-53ರಲ್ಲಿ ಸುಮಾರು 92,000 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಆದಾಯ ಬಂದಿದೆ.

ಈ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ನಮ್ಮ ಕಾಡಿನ ಮರಗಳನ್ನು ಇಷ್ಟು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಅದರ ಸಾಗಾಣಿಕೆ ಖರ್ಚೇ ವಿಪರೀತವಾಗಿ ನಮಗೆ ಬರುತ್ತಿರುವ ಆದಾಯ ಬಹಳ ಶೋಚನೀಯವಾಗಿದೆ. ಗಂಧದ ಮರದಲ್ಲಿ ಬರತಕ್ಕ 33 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳು ಕೂಡ ಉಳಿಯುವುದೇ ಬಹಳ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗಿದೆ.

ಇದೇ ರೀತಿ ಮರಗಳ ಮಾರಾಟದಿಂದ ಬಂದಿರುವ ದುಡ್ಡು ಆಶಾದಾಯಕವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. 1953-54 ರಲ್ಲಿ 22 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಮರಗಳ ಮಾರಾಟದಿಂದ ಹೊಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಮರಗಳನ್ನು ಕಡಿಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಖರ್ಚು 22 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಬಂದಿದೆ. 1953-54 ರಲ್ಲಿ ನೋಡುವುದಾದರೆ, 10 ಲಕ್ಷ